REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, and 6 are now pending in the application. Applicant cancels claims 3-5 without disclaimer or prejudice to the subject matter contained therein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kawasaki (JP Pat. No. 08-078674). This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claims 1, 2 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fujitsu (JP10-256839).

Kawasaki and Fujitsu fail to show, teach, or suggest source and drain regions that comprise first impurity diffusion layers formed of a specific impurity introduced in the semiconductor layer adjacent two sides of the gate electrode and second impurity diffusion layers provided in the semiconductor layer adjacent the first impurity diffusion layers and opposite from the gate electrode, the second impurity diffusion layers being in contact with the first impurity diffusion layers, wherein the first impurity diffusion layers comprise a diffusion suppression impurity for suppressing diffusion of the specific impurity into the semiconductor layer.

For anticipation to be present under 35 U.S.C §102(b), there must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure as viewed by one skilled in the field of the invention. *Scripps Clinic & Res. Found. V. Genentech,*

Inc., 18 USPQ.2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991). All of the limitations of the claim must be inherent or expressly disclosed and must be arranged as in the claim. *Constant v. Advanced Micro-Devices, Inc.*, 7 USPQ.2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Kawasaki and Fujitsu fail to disclose the limitation of source and drain regions that include second impurity diffusion layers as claim 1 recites.

The Examiner alleges that Kawasaki discloses source and drain layers comprising first impurity diffusion layers 6a and 6b and second impurity diffusion layers 7a and 7b. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Kawasaki discloses that regions 6a and 6b are the source and drain regions. Regions 7a and 7b are nitrogen implantation areas. Paragraph [0031] of the specification recites "[b]y these nitrogen impregnation fields 7a and 7b, an impurity can prevent a perpendicular direction and being spread horizontally effectively." In other words, the regions 7a and 7b suppress diffusion.

However, it does not appear that Kawasaki discloses another impurity diffusion layer. The Examiner maintains that the regions 7a and 7b are the second impurity diffusion layers, and that the source and drain regions 6a and 6b are first impurity diffusion layers that comprise a diffusion suppression immunity. The Examiner relies on claim 2 of Kawasaki to disclose this structure. Applicant respectfully notes that claim 2 recites that the impregnation layer is "currently formed so that said source/drain field may be covered." In other words, it appears that the impregnation layer of claim 2 is referring to the impregnation fields 7a and 7b. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is relying on the impregnation fields 7a and 7b to disclose both the first impurity diffusion layer comprising a diffusion suppression impurity and the second impurity diffusion layers.

In contrast, Applicant's claim 1 requires that the source and drain regions comprise both "first impurity diffusion layers" and "second impurity diffusion layers." The first impurity diffusion layers comprise "a diffusion suppression impurity." Kawasaki does not disclose that the source and drain regions comprise both first and second impurity diffusion layers. Instead, Kawasaki discloses source and drain regions that are surrounded by impregnation fields 7a and 7b. The source and drain regions 6a and 6b do not comprise the impregnation fields 7a and 7b. Further, Kawasaki does not disclose first impurity diffusion layers that comprise a diffusion suppression impurity.

The Examiner alleges that Fujitsu discloses second impurity diffusion layers 3 provided in the semiconductor layer adjacent the first impurity diffusion layers and opposite from the gate electrode. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Fujitsu discloses source and drain regions 6s and 6d. The source and drain regions 6s and 6d are formed in a well 3. The source and drain regions 6s and 6d do not comprise the well 3.

In contrast, Applicant's claim 1 recites "wherein the source and drain regions comprise: first impurity diffusion layers" and "second impurity diffusion layers." In other words, the source and drain regions include the first and second impurity diffusion layers. Fujitsu does not disclose that the source and drain regions comprise first and second impurity diffusion layers. Instead, Fujitsu discloses that the source and drain regions are formed in a well.

Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1, as well as its dependent claim, should be allowable for at least the above reasons. Claim 6 should be allowable for at least similar reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb 15, 2006

By: _____

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382

Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/DMA